

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 36 remain in the application. Claims 37 through 43 have been added. Applicants respectfully request allowance of each of pending claims 1 through 43.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 through 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Georgakos et al. (U.S. 6,212,102). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position for the following reasons.

Regarding the independent claim 1, Georgakos et al. do not teach a memory array with byte-alterable capability. Claim 1 discloses a memory array comprising a select gate metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) device and a split-gate memory cell. The byte-alterable capability allows each individual memory byte of the memory array be accessed independently for reading, programming or erasing. (see page 10, lines 20-21) This is achieved by utilizing the selected gate MOSFET device to isolate the split gate memory cell device of a particular memory byte. (see page 11, lines 1-3) Thus, the particular byte is inhibited from operations, such as erasing and programming, of other memory bytes in the memory array.

Georgakos et al. teach an electrical erasable programmable read only memory (EEPROM) cell, which is not associated with other EEPROM cells to constitute a memory array. Nor do Georgakos et al. disclose the byte-alterable capability feature. Tables 1 through 3 talk about various biasing schemes, by which the EEPROM cell can be read, programmed or erased. Nevertheless, they do not teach how the EEPROM cell

can be inhibited from operations, such as erasing and programming, of other cells associated therewith. As such, Georgakos et al. do not anticipate the independent claim 1 of this invention.

For the same reasons discussed above, Georgakos et al. do not anticipate the independent claim 19, which discloses a method of producing a memory array with byte-alterable capability.

The remaining dependent claims further limit their respective independent claims in a patentable sense, and are therefore also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

A new set of claims 37 through 43 has been added for clarifying the invention, and is believed to be written in a patentable sense.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this application in an allowable form. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to a novel subject matter, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore, respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Should the Examiner deem that any further clarification is desirable, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Howard Chen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,615

Duane Morris LLP
One Market Street
Spear Tower, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-1104
Telephone: (415) 371-2200
Facsimile: (415) 371-2201